

Appl. No. 09/937,634  
Amdt. dated March 20, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of December 21, 2005

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants hereby submit amendments for improving the clarity of the subject matter in the specification.

Specifically, the phrase in line 23 of page 5 of the application has been amended to read "... and the second being a high-speed cipher  $E()$  which is functionally a ciphering function." to further define and thereby clarify the purpose of the high-speed cipher. Applicants submit that a high-speed cipher or a cipher by any other name is a ciphering function for creating a ciphertext as described in lines 25-26 of page 5 of the application, where it is explained that a secret key  $s$  and a data segment  $d$  is accepted by the high-speed cipher for producing a ciphertext. Applicants further submit that only the encryption and decryption functionalities of the cipher is considered as pertinent to claims 1-46.

Applicants respectfully submit amendments to claims 1, 14, 24 and 37 for improving clarity thereof and to better point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of Applicants' invention. Further explanations on the amendments are provided in the following response to the rejection of claims 1, 14, 24 and 37.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 11-13, 21-23, 34-36 and 44-46 is amended to correct antecedent problems therein.

Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added in the amendments.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 for Claims 1, 14, 24 and 37

In the Office Action, Examiner rejects Applicants' invention as defined in claims 1, 14, 24 and 37 in relation to 35 U.S.C. 112, by explaining that the "high-speed cipher" phrases with respect to claims 1, 14, 24 and 37, render the claims indefinite and unclear in that neither means or steps nor interrelationship of means or steps are set forth in these claims in order to achieve the desired results expressed in the "high-speed cipher" phrases.

#### Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 for Claims 1, 14, 24 and 37

Applicants respectfully acknowledge Examiner's objection to the "high-speed cipher" phrase. Applicants agree that the "high-speed cipher" is a relative term and that the concept of

**Appl. No. 09/937,634**  
**Amdt. dated March 20, 2006**  
**Reply to Office Action of December 21, 2005**

speed of a cipher may differ for different systems. Therefore, claims 1, 14, 24 and 37 have been amended to improve clarity thereof. Specifically, for each of claims 1, 14, 24 and 37, the term "high-speed cipher" has been amended to read "ciphering function" for removing the indefinite term concerning the speed of the cipher and to thereby clarify the subject matter in the respective claims. Support for the amendments is found in lines 23-26 of page 5 of the application.

Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1, 14, 24 and 37 are respectfully requested.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 for Claims 2-10, 15-20, 25-33 and 38-43**

Examiner rejects claims 2-10, 15-20, 25-33 and 38-43 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

**Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 for Claims 2-10, 15-20, 25-33 and 38-43**

Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 2-10, 15-20, 25-33 and 38-43 is directly or indirectly dependent on one of the amended claims 1, 11-14, 21-24, 34-37 and 44-46 for defining the subject matter therein. In light of Applicants' amendments and accompanying explanations to original claims 1, 11-14, 21-24, 34-37 and 44-46 to impart clarity and definitiveness to the indefinite elements therein, Applicants submit that claims 2-10, 15-20, 25-33 and 38-43 are now definite and that the subject matter therein is now clearly defined. Therefore, rejections to claims 2-10, 15-20, 25-33 and 38-43 are overcome and consequently fall away.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to claims 2-10, 15-20, 25-33 and 38-43 are respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the

Appl. No. 09/937,634  
Amdt. dated March 20, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of December 21, 2005

event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.36(a), and any fees required are hereby charged to Conley Rose, P.C.'s Deposit Account Number 03-2769/2085-00200.

Respectfully submitted,



Matthew R. Moscicki  
Attorney for Applicants  
Conley Rose, P.C.  
P.O. Box 3267  
Houston, Texas 77253-3267  
(713) 238-8000  
(713) 238-8008 (facsimile)